

240802

Edgar Knight  
Florida Community College at Jacksonville  
Student

Federal Aviation Administration  
400 7<sup>th</sup> St. S. W. PL-401  
Washington, DC 20590

FAA-99-5401-119

Dear FAA:

I want to response to Document FAA-1999-5401-89, Aging Airplane Safety, and would like to make my personal suggestions possibly assisting in preventing future airline accidents. Involvement in aviation transportation and past histories of aviation mishaps, should be a good reason to have a more stringent regulation when it comes to the inspections of aircrafts. Because air disasters being of more catastrophic nature than most other transportation accidents, the upkeep and inspection should be dealt with in a more extensive fashion.

First off, the interval for each inspection should be condensed, due to the constant wear and tear of airplanes. Thorough inspections should be conducted every eight years instead of every fourteen years as it is stated under title 14 in the Code of Federal Regulations. Scheduled maintenance along with spot checks should be performed periodically within the eight years to guarantee airworthiness of each individual plane. These spot checks should be conducted on at least twenty percent of each company's and owner's airplane inventory. It must be made adamant that no aircraft will be airborne unless inspection and maintenance is completed and officially stamped off.

Secondly, the FAA should create a whole new entity within its organization that consists of highly qualified professionals. To further break this down, teams can be created that consists of technicians, inspectors and supervisors. Each member should be recertified at least once every three years and cross-trained in more than one area other than their specialty. Each inspection should be conducted by maintenance teams consisting of these qualified technicians trained in their specific areas. The owner of the craft or a designated representative should be present at all times so the inspection being conducted is a joint effort and there is agreements between both parties. Logs on the type of work being performed should be kept and signed off by parties to approve each area of interest of the aircraft. The size and make of an aircraft would determine the amount of people, the procedures and the time it would take to thoroughly look over an airplane and ensure all areas has been looked at, tested, corrected, and stamped for approval. For example, an inspection for a Cessna would differ greatly to say a Boeing 747.

Manufacturers should put a recommended life limit time on each type of airplane and decommissioning them after reaching so many years or hours. If a company or owner wishes to continue the use of an airplane, they should obtain a written approval from the FAA as well as a written endorsement from the maintenance team stating limitations of that particular aircraft. The FAA may deem an aircraft no longer airworthy for flight and ground the aircraft permanently. If an owner or company wishes to contest this rule they may generate a written statement and give reasons and explanations of why they want to keep their aircraft operational. Final authority should come from a board or committee who reviews this request and makes a determination and must state their reasons for their findings. This rule should apply not only to continental United States, but should be emphasized and made law world-wide within the aviation industry.

What I am proposing, hopefully will add to the reasons and meanings of The Aircraft Safety Act of 1991 and prevent further accidents of both commercial and private airplanes.

Sincerely,  
  
Edgar Knight